



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,594	03/12/2004	Shreyas J. Kamat	03292.101900	2593
66569	7590	03/13/2008	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				KAZIMI, HANI M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,594	KAMAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hani Kazimi	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on May 24, 2007. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references cited in the Search Report filed on June 5, 2007 have been considered, The references have been cited by the Examiner on a PTO form 892 in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, claims 1 and 9 recite "a plurality of seller applications operable to store end-purchase information and to populate a message wherein each one of the

plurality of seller applications accesses the information through a different interface at the premises of the seller".

The limitations in these claims do not have support in the originally filed disclosure. Applicant is requested to cite relevant portion(s) of the original disclosure that teaches these limitations. Examiner notes that applicant cited paragraph 0024 as providing support for this limitation. However, paragraph 0024 reads thus:

"The use of web services to provide such functionality allows a seller to almost seamlessly integrate its existing back office, intranet, or any other application with application server 108. Such an approach does not require a dedicated communication link between the seller and the supplier's application server 108. The result is a cost savings for sellers."

It is not clear how one of ordinary skill in the art would correlate the aforementioned paragraph with the said claim limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. US Pat. No. 5,798,508 A in view of Bliss et al. US Pat. No. 5,999,938 and further in view of Kalajan US Pat. No. 5,941,954.

Claims 1 and 9, Walker teaches a system and a corresponding method configured to facilitate the transmission of messages from a seller to a supplier comprising: a supplier application; a web application coupled to the supplier application and operable to accept user input containing one or more portion of a message; (fig. 1A, 2A, 6-10, and column 2, line 56 thru column 5, line 17 and column 8, line 7 thru column 11, line 25).

Walker does not explicitly teach a plurality of seller applications operable to store end-purchase information and to populate a message wherein each one of the plurality of seller applications accesses the information through a different interface at the premises of the seller; and a proxy application coupled between the seller application and the supplier application, wherein the proxy application is configured to encrypt/decrypt and transmit data from the seller application to the supplier application. Bliss teaches creating and populating data fields from different sources without having to manually re-enter the data from each of the sources into the destination data fields (col. 4, lines 57-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to include this feature for the obvious reason of avoiding manually re-entering the data.

Kalajan discloses a proxy application coupled to between two applications, wherein the proxy application is configured to encrypt/decrypt and transmit data from the seller application to the supplier application (col. 4, line 64 thru col. 5, line 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to include this feature for the obvious reason of providing a resource for encrypting and decrypting messages between the applications.

Claims 2 and 10, Walker teaches wherein the seller application is a web services application (fig. 2A, col. 4, line 63 thru col. 3, line 16).

Claims 4 and 12, Walker teaches wherein the supplier application is configured to facilitate exchanging information with one of the seller application and the supplier application (fig. 2A, col. 4, line 63 thru col. 3, line 16).

Claims 7 and 15, Walker teaches wherein the system facilitates transmitting information related to the sale of traveler's checks (abstract).

Claims 8 and 16, Walker teaches wherein the system facilitates transmitting information related to the sale of prepaid services (abstract).

5. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. US Pat. No. 5,798,508 A in view of Bliss et al. US Pat. No. 5,999,938 in view of Kalajan US Pat. No. 5,941,954 and further in view of Hejlsberg et al US Pat. No. 7,165,239.

Claims 3 and 11, Walker, Bliss and Kalajan do not explicitly teach wherein the proxy application is configured to facilitate transmitting data using SOAP and HTTP between the seller application and the supplier application.

Hejlsberg teaches facilitate transmitting data using SOAP and HTTP between applications (col. 3, lines 45-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to include this feature because theses protocols are well known industrial standard protocols.

6. Claims 5-6 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. US Pat. No. 5,798,508 A in view of Bliss et al. US Pat. No. 5,999,938 in view of Kalajan US Pat. No. 5,941,954 and further in view of Gleason et al. US Pat. Publication No. 20030195762.

Claims 5-6 and 13-14, Walker, Bliss and Kalajan do not explicitly teach wherein the proxy application facilitates transmitting information using an XML format; and wherein the XML format is a SOAP message conforming to the WSDL. Gleason teaches transmission of information using XML format wherein the XML format is a

SOAP message that conforms to WSDL (Para 0048). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to include this feature for the obvious reason of communicating information between applications in XML/SOAP via the internet using WSDL.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Hani M. Kazimi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691